

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 remain in the application and claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9-12 have been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Keller et al. in view of Olafsson.

A features of the present invention is the use of a specific reference symbol or synchronizing code series that produces a two-peak waveform output when input to a correlator of a receiver. See Figs. 19, 22, and 23, and page 19, line 23 to page 21, line 6 of the present application, for example.

An advantage of this features of the present invention is that a common receiver can be used because a distinguishable waveform pattern from other waveform patterns produced by conventional communication systems is produced in the receiver.

Independent claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9-12 have been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Keller et al. and Olafsson fails to show or suggest a specific reference symbol producing a two-peak waveform output when the reference symbol is input to a correlator of a receiver. Keller et al. is nearly teaching synchronization algorithms for wireless LANs that are robust against channel noise and Olafsson is teaching line probing techniques for modem systems. Neither of the cited references, alone or in combination, show or suggest a reference

symbol producing a two-peak waveform output when input to a correlator of a receiver.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1-10, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable distinct over Keller et al. in view of Olafsson.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 11 and 12 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Keller et al. in view of Olafsson and Kwak.

As discussed above, it is submitted that the combination of Keller et al. and Olafsson fails to show or suggest a reference symbol producing a two-peak waveform output when input to a correlator of a receiver and, because there are no features in Kwak, being directed to a digital TV receiver, that somehow could be combined with Keller et al. and Olafsson and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11 and 12 are patentable distinct over Keller et al. in view of Olafsson and Kwak.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP

  
Jay H. Maioli  
Reg No. 27,213

JHM/PCF:pmc  
encl.